Adams Sentinel

MEMORIAL

OF

PROFESSOR S. S. SCHMUCKER,

RELATIVE TO BINDING OUT

MINOR COLORED CHILDREN.

Dec. 19
1814

READ IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 7, 1839.

HARRISBURG:
BOAS & COPLAN—PRINTERS.

1839.

E185
.93
.P4133

MEMORIAL, &c.

MINOR COLORED POPULATION OF PENNSYLVANIA.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

THE MEMORIAL OF S. S. SCHMUCKER, citizen of Adams county, in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

RESPECTFULLY REPRESENTS :—

That your memorialist in common with multitudes of his fellow citizens, has long contemplated with regret the depressed and unprofitable condition of the great mass of the colored population of our state. It is well known to your honorable body, that the major part of them fail to make a comfortable support for themselves, or to prove useful to those around them, whilst not a few are found in almost every town, who pursue no visible means of making an honest living, but subsist in part at least by petty depredations on the rights and property of others. There is dubtless a combination of causes to which the deplorable condition, this portion of our population may be traced by the accurate observor, a condition which no philanthropist or true friend of his country can contemplate with indifference; yet, after much attention to this subject, your memorialist is persuaded that there is one cause more operative than all the rest combined, the removal of which is entirely within the power of your honorable body. When we reflect on the powerful influence which early habits exert on all men throughout life, and remember that, whilst nineteen twentieths of our fellow citizens, train up their children to some regular business or calling as a means of future subsistance, not one in twenty of our colored population is brought up to regular labor and business of any kind, it appears obvious, that the want of early training to industry and business, is the grand cause of the indolence and unthriftiness of so large a portion of them. Who among us, when we occasionally see one of our citizens raising his children in idleness, without theaching them any regular business, does not confidently predict, that they will prove worthless? Since, then, the cause of the evil complained

of, mainly, in the neglect of colored parents to bind out their children at a proper age, to some regular art, trade or calling, and in their incapacity to teach them such art or trade themselves, it seems evident that the remedy must be sought in legislative provisions to obviate this neglect. Your memorialist therefore, presents a sketch of such provision, to which he respectfully invites your attention. It was at first his design to bring this matter before you by petitions, with numerous signatures, of which it is believed, tens of thousands could easily be procured; but the facts in the case, and the feelings of our fellow citizens are so well known to all the members of your honorable body, that it was deemed unnecessary to occupy your time by an attempt to prove them by numerous petitions.

It cannot justly be objected to the annexed bill, that it infringes the rights of colored parents, since it only requires them to do what, as good parents, they ought not to neglect, and what other parents generally perform from choice. It is, moreover, only an exercise of the right of any community to protect themselves from the depredations of others, by legislative enactment, designed to prevent crime rather than punish it; and of the right of the commonwealth to improve the condition of her own population; a right, the justice of which cannot be denied, if the legislative action based on it, require only performance, of what all acknowledge to be a duty, and what the residue of the community have done without legislative constraint. The principle of this bill seems, moreover, to be sanctioned by the decisions of our courts in which it is held, that "if the parent of a child lives at a distance, and long relinquished the protection of the child, a next friend to the child may bind it, and the act be valid," (1 S. & R. 366.) Those colored parents who neglect to either teach or have their children taught any mode of subsistance, have certainly failed, however undesignedly it may have been, in the proper "protection" of their children, and the law may very properly step in as a "next friend" to supply the neglect. And it is also in their power to supercede the action of the law by voluntarily performing the requisitions, before the age of their children brings them within its provisions.

The age is fixed late, in order that time may be left for the children to reap the benefit of our noble free school system, before they are indentured.

It is the opinion of numerous persons whom your memorialist has

consulted, that after the accumulated number of minors whom the law will find unprovided for, shall have been disposed of, there will be no difficulty in finding places for all, especially among our agriculturalists and others, to whom they would prove very useful assistants; and it is probable that in most places no difficulty will occur even in the first instance. Thus this population instead of being crowded into our cities, towns and villages, where many spend their time in idleness, intemperance and wretchedness, would be distributed especially through the country, and grow up with habits of industry and capacity, for self support and usefulness. It is not unworthy of remark, that the execution of the law would not cost the commonwealth a dollar, whilst it would secure most important benefits to the community, and especially, to the unhappy and neglected portion of our race, whose improvement it immediately contemplates. For these reasons your memorialist very respectfully solicits your body to consider the annexed bill, and if in your judgment, it is calculated to advance the public good, to [illegible] it into a law, with such corrections as your wisdom may suggest.

S. S. SCHMUCKER,
Citizen of Adams county, Pa.

Gettysburg, March 2, 1839.

An act concerning the minor colored population of this Commonwealth.

Whereas, A large portion of the colored population of this commonwealth, has heretofore, not been brought up to any regular trade, art, occupation or calling; in consequence of which they have labored under peculiar difficulties in making an honest support; and not having acquired habits of industry in youth, have failed to prove as useful to themselves and others, as they otherwise would have done.

Sect. I. Therefore be it enacted, that from and after the passage of this act, all colored minors in this commonwealth, who are above the age of fourteen, if males, and thirteen, if females, who have not been bound by their parents or other legal authority, by regular indenture, to serve as apprentices to some art, trade, calling or service shall be bound as apprentices in the manner hereafter specified; except in the following cases, viz:

1. When the father himself is of temperate industrious habits, follows some regular art, trade, or calling, keeps his son or sons reg-

ularly employed, and is able to support, and capable to teach him or them said art, trade or calling.

2. When said minor produces a certificate from a qualified and respectable teacher, that he is regularly and successfully employed in pursuing the higher branches of education, is of good moral character, and has the means of honest support.

3. In the case of females, when it shall be made to appear that they are needed for the conduct of the family, and are kept employed, and that their parents can comfortably support them, and teach them domestic service.

SECT. II. It shall be the duty of the commissioners of the several counties of this commonwealth annually, to issue their precept to the assessors of every township, ward or district within the county, requiring them, when making out the list of taxables, to enter in a separate column, and return a complete and accurate list of all colored minors, specifying the name and age of each, residing within their townships, wards or districts, above the age of fourteen, if males, and thirteen, if females, who have not been regularly bound by indenture as apprentices to some art, trade, calling or service; which return, the said commissioners shall deliver to the clerk of quarter sessions, to be filed for the use of said court.

SECT. III. It shall be the duty of the court aforesaid, at the session next ensuing, to appoint two justices of the peace in each township, ward or district, who, after giving ten days notice to the parent, guardians or friends of all the minors reported in their township, ward or district, shall meet at the time and place of which the notice aforesaid shall have been given to the parent, guardians or friends of the minors, and decide upon the cases of exception according to the provisions of this act, and within thirty days thereafter, bind all the minors embraced in the provisions of this act to persons of good character: provided that an appeal shall be from their decision to the court aforesaid, if prosecuted at the court next ensuing; the said justices to receive each one dollar for every minor legally bound, to be paid by the master at the time of indenture.

SECT. IV. All persons embraced in the exceptions specified in section one of this act, shall nevertheless be annually reported by the assessors, and returned by the court to the justices of the peace aforesaid, and shall be continued as exceptions, only so long as the grounds of such exception in the judgment of said justices continued.

SECT. V. All the laws of this commonwealth, for the regulation and protection of apprentices, are hereby extended to all colored minors bound as apprentices under the provisions of this act: and by colored minors in this act are meant negroes, and also, mulattoes of every grade.

SECT. VI. Any justice of the peace neglecting to attend to the duties assigned him under this act, shall on information to the court aforesaid, be fined twenty dollars, for each case, one half to go to the informer, and the other half to the county treasury, for the benefit of the common schools in the district in which said justice resides.

SECT. VII. And any person desirous of having one of said minors indented to him, shall apply to one of the justices aforesaid, who if said applicant be temperate and of good character, shall give him a certificate, which he may present to the parent or guardian of said minor, and invite him to bring his or her said child or ward before the justice. And if said parent, guardian or minor refuses to go, it may be lawful for the justice to cause them to appear in the manner provided, in the case of absconding apprentices, in the act of September 29, 1770, for the regulation of apprentices, the expense of said process to be also paid by the person to whom said minor shall be indented. And if there be several applicants of temperate habits and good character, the minor shall have the privilege of election.

SECT. VIII. This act shall continue in force fifteen years and no longer.

This is a bad country to *sell sin* in; and therefore the rate of exchange of the Roman Chancery dont need to be exposed to vulgar eyes. A little traffic, in a quiet, honest way,—suits the present state of things better. It is a *hard money* business as yet; and the "*Banque du Pape*"—is therefore repudiated. We have two copies lying before us.

[For the Baltimore Literary and Religious Magazine.]

THE REVIEWER REVIEWED, OR SCHMUCKER'S THEOLOGY AGAIN.

Messrs. Editors:

ALTHOUGH encumbered by a multitude of other duties, I had for some time past intended in accordance with your former invitation, to transmit a contribution for your magazine, which so fearlessly exposes the dangerous and antichristian principles of popery, in the so called Rome of America. The cause of Protestantism is one, in which, as in that of Tracts, Bibles and Sabbath Schools, individuals of the several Christian denominations, though differing among themselves, can harmoniously labor together; and I have repeatedly heard as well from your own lips, as from my brethren in your city, that on subjects of common interest, you are a friend of mutual co-operation. An article in your last number however, seems to admonish me, that a communication of a different character, might at present be quite as appropriate; and although we are just in the closing and hurried week of the session, and the reply, to be in time for your next number, must be sent in a few days, I hasten to pen it.

For some reason or other, one of your contributors has felt called on, to invite the attention of the public to a little work which I published six years ago, at the request first of the Synod of West Pennsylvania, and then of the General Synod; and which has since its publication, been recommended by different judicatories, including the General Synod, as a correct exhibition of the views most generally entertained by the Lutheran church in this country. As the work is designed chiefly for Lutheran laymen and theological students, as it attacks no other denomination, but treats all with respect, it is singular that the reviewer should at this late day recall the attention of the public to it. This appears the more surprising, as he seems to regard the work as possessing claims of a very inferior order. After all the zeal with which the reviewer goes to work, and the zest with which he seems to devour his supposed victim, betray more confidence in the claims of the work, than he himself seems to be aware. But perhaps the solution of this matter may be found in the fact, incidentally stated by him, that he found students of other denominations reading and praising the book—Hinc illæ lacrymæ! Therefore it was necessary to enrol the Popular Theology, in the *Index Expurgatorius* of Protestant

popery! Or, possibly the selection of the Popular Theology, as the point of attack, may be in part a *ruse de guerre*, to warn his readers against looking at a plan for promoting brotherly union, recently proposed in the *Appeal to the American Churches.* Now if the reviewer felt it his duty to counteract the influence of either of these works, he had certainly a right to do so; but it was no less his duty to execute his task with candour and Christian fairness. As to his numerous unfriendly personal insinuations, his language of denunciation, his charges of heresy, &c. &c., I shall assuredly not take the trouble to answer them in any way. They may pass for what, in the eyes of impartial readers, they are worth. Indeed, the reviewer has so completely done, and overdone his work, has killed his foe thrice dead, or to pursue his own favorite martial figure, he has given his "trumpet" such an overstrained blast, that it has yielded a stentorous, uncertain sound, and his impartial hearers will perceive that they must make some grains of allowance for the overheated ardor of their herald, and look elsewhere for a fair estimate of the book. I will only remark, in the language of the Biblical Repertory, who animadverting, on Dr. Channing's charge that the Orthodox of Massachusetts, were aiming at the overthrow of religious liberty; "It is to be regretted that 'the reviewer' should so far forget himself, as to adopt the *art of controversy*, which consists in making the adversary odious, instead of proving him in error."

Before the reviewer subjects the Popular Theology to the knife, he indulges in some observations on the Theology of Drs. Stoor and Flatt, which to the biblical scholar, must sound singular enough. He pronounces that work "very insipid and spiritless," "a complete failure," and "the whole almost a theological hoax." That the work would prove very insipid and spiritless to a man, whose reading has been so much in the polite literature of "Gulliver's Travels" and the legands of "St. Patric," and who evinces such a fondness for the animated chase of hunting heretics, is not surprising. That the lay reader may however judge of the appropriateness of the reviewer's ridicule, it may be proper to make some explanation. During the last sixty years every part of the sacred canon has been assailed by the infidel critics of Germany. All the writings of antiquity have been ransacked for objections, either to the genuineness or integrity of every book of Scripture, but especially of the New Testament. The integrity of some passages and the interpretation of others have been disputed. A series of philosophical systems more or less infidel, have deluged Germany and continental Europe, and threatened to overthrow the church of the Redeemer in the land of the Reformation. For thirty years, during the height of this intellectual war, Storr and Flatt were among the foremost of the few, who defended the cross of Christ, and in a Quarterly Magazine* and numerous other publications, presented the most able refutations of every form of critical and philosophical infidelity, which Germany produced. In this thorough sifting of God's word, many passages which the older divines (and per-

* Flatt's Magazin für Dogmatick und moral.

haps some of our day, like the reviewer with "Cruden's Concordance" for his guide,) adduced as proof of particular doctrines, were given up as inapplicable. Now the Theology of Dr. Storr is composed in view of all these assaults, gives a condensed view of the different objections and theories, with short refutations of them, vindicates the orthodox interpretation of the Scripture proofs for the trinity, divinity of Christ, &c., gives new interpretations of some passages and a thoroughly sifted collection of others; and in all these departments furnishes the student with specific references to the volume and page of the best works on both sides. In short, that work presents a plain, impartial statement, not of new doctrinal discoveries, against which Storr contended, but of what remain as the clearly ascertained doctrines of the Bible, after it had passed through that fiery ordeal. In many cases it states merely results; and it is designed as a manual to conduct the student through the more extensive study of the different topics. That such a book could be fully appreciated only by those who have attained some proficiency in critical and philological studies is evident; and there is one other method of accounting for the reviewer's judgment of this work, which seems not to have occurred to him, namely, that however learned he may be in the whole circle of other sciences, he has paid but little attention to these. That the work is differently estimated by many clergymen in our land, is evinced by the fact, that large and expensive as it is, two editions of one thousand copies each, have already been sold. But how men of the very first standing in the American church speak of the work, without necessarily agreeing with its author's views on every topic discussed, their own written language, communicated to the writer at the time he published his translation, may show. Say, Drs. Alexander, Miller, and Hodge; "From the productions of Dr. Storr which have already fallen under their observation, the subscribers have been led to form a high estimate of his erudition, his judiciousness, his zeal for the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, of his habit of extensive and accurate investigation, and especially of his intimate acquaintance with the sacred Scriptures. These characteristics are abundantly manifested in the work you have now submitted to their examination. They conceive it to be one of great value in itself and particularly adapted to the state of theological literature in our country." Dr. Turner, professor of Bib. Lit. in the Episcopal Theol. Sem. in New York says: "To those who are at all acquainted with the author's work, it is unnecessary to say one word of recommendation. It must be a gratifying circumstance to the friends of theological literature among us, that a system of divinity drawn up by so great a biblical scholar, is about to be presented to them in their vernacular tongue." And professor Stuart of Andover, thus characterizes Dr. Storr and his work: "I have been acquainted with the character and principal works of Storr for some years. During the last twenty years of his life, he was considered, I believe, by all parties of theologians in Germany, as the most distinguished defender of those sentiments, that are generally styled the doctrines of the Reformation, which that country then afforded. His Biblical Theology is a work of great

labor, of much thought and profound disquisition." The reader may judge how much the opinion of the reviewer is worth, who pronounces the publication of such a work "almost a theological hoax."

We now proceed to the ill-fated Popular Theology, and as an evidence of our disposition to profit by the hint of the reviewer, ("lucus, a non lucendo,") we shall pursue the *lucidus* ordo of exposing first his misapprehensions, then his misrepresentations of the book, and finally his want of acquaintance with the subject in dispute, or (to use his own polite language) "his flippancy in asserting things to be so and so, without proof."

His first misapprehension relates to the phrase "Calvin and his supralapsarian followers," which he contends necessarily implies that Calvin was a supralapsarian, which we certainly did not intend to assert, for we entertain the opposite opinion, though the subject has been disputed. On a review of our language we concede its susceptibility of such an interpretation. Perhaps, to a reader unacquainted with the facts in the case, it would most naturally convey that idea. But when it is recollected, that both sublapsarians and supralapsarians were universally termed Calvinists, and followers of Calvin, and that the supralapsarians held the absoluteness of the divine decrees with more rigor than did some of his sublapsarian followers; it is evident that the phrase "Calvin and his supralapsarian followers," would not necessarily imply that Calvin was a supralapsarian. The reviewer also contends that the phrase "Calvin's peculiar views," amounts to the assertion, that Calvin was entirely alone in those opinions. But here we think he is hypocritical. How often do we speak of "the peculiar views of Luther on the eucharist"; yet who would thence infer, that his associates did not participate in these views? Certainly no one. By the peculiar views of Luther or Calvin, we generally understand those views by which they with their followers are distinguished from each other; and that the doctrine of *absolute* decrees was in some respects such a distinguishing doctrine will be seen in the sequel.

Again the reviewer has mistaken the position of the book, of its author, and of the Lutheran church. He reasons and censures us, as if we professed, or were under any obligation to adhere to every thing in the Augsburg Confession. Yet, even from his quotation from the work, his readers can perceive his blunder; and see that in rejecting the few errors of that Confession, we are doing exactly what the Lutheran church professes to do, for she binds her ministers *only to the fundamentals* of the Augsburg Confession. Indeed from the manner in which the reviewer lavishes his censures on us for not adhering to every jot and tittle of the creed, we very much doubt whether he has ever read the whole of it! Does he know what the portions omitted in the Popular Theology, contain? Does he know that one of them speaks disparagingly of the obligation of the Christian sabbath? Would he have us practice private confession and absolution? "If he has not read them, why does he write about them," and especially why does he adventure to censure his brethren for doing that, for which, if better informed, he would praise us? In short, if he had given a fair account of the

book he would have presented to his readers a statement like this: "The Lutherans in this country do not believe any one of the reformers to have been either infallible or inspired; although they regard the doctrines avowed by Luther, Melanchthon and their followers, as upon the whole, more accordant with God's word, than those embraced by the Calvinistic churches. They believe that the progressive studies of learned and pious men of different denominations, the increasing lights of philology and exegesis, have tended to elucidate more fully some portions of the Scriptures; so that whilst they have abandoned some things taught in the Augsburg Confession, such as the doctrine of the real presence, private confession, lax views of the sabbath, and in these respects have approximated nearer to the Reformed churches; yet on the doctrine of absolute predestination, and its cognate topics, they have receded farther from the Calvinistic scheme, than Luther and his earlier followers had done, and occupy exactly the grounds of the Moravians (who profess the same creed), the Methodists, the Non-Calvinistic Episcopalians, and some Congregationalists and others in our land." Such is the exact position of the Lutheran church, and has in the main been of the orthodox portion of it in Germany, for near a century past. This position is avowed in the book, and ought to have been apprehended by the reviewer. The *right* of the Lutheran church to occupy this ground, in common with the majority of Protestants in this land, we shall not stop to argue with the reviewer or any other man; and all his vituperation for our not adhering to every thing in the Augsburg Confession, falls harmless at our feet. The Christian propriety, yea the duty of pursuing this course, of abandoning human creeds just as far as our continued studies convince us that they differ from the word of God, and of making no more articles a test of Christian and ecclesiastical fellowship, than experience proves necessary to harmonious co-operation, is we conceive a most solemn and appropriate topic of investigation, our views of which we have endeavoured to present in the Appeal to the American Churches.

But we presume the reviewer himself does not receive every thing taught by Calvin, and yet is unconscious of impropriety in calling himself a Calvinist. Does he believe in the doctrine of non-elect infants? Does he hold with Calvin the absoluteness and unconditionality of the decree of *reprobation*? Does he receive Calvin's peculiar views of the eucharist, intermediate between those of Luther and Zwingle?* And happy indeed should I be if the reviewer would cordially embrace the opinion of Calvin on Christian liberality and union. The reader will excuse the introduction of a quotation from the Appeal above referred to, in elucidation of this topic:† "The writer takes pleasure in being able to cite in support

---

*Calvin's language is: "Dico igiter in cœnæ *mysterio* per symbola panis et vini Christum *vere* (the very word used in the Augsburg Confession,) nobis exhiberi, adeoque corpus et sanguinem ejus, in quibus omnem obedientiam pro comparanda nobis justitai adimplevit; quo scilicet primum in unum corpus cum ipso coalescamus; deinde participes substantiæ ejus facti, in bonorum omnium communicatione virtutem quoque sentiamus. Instit. Lib. iv. c. xvii. 11.

† Pp. 105, 106, of 2d edition.

of his position the opinion of that distinguished servant of God, Calvin; whose zeal against *fundamental* errorists will not be disputed, but whose magnanimous liberality in reference to all but fundamentals appears to be but little known, and still less appreciated. He even goes much further than our plan of union proposes, and dissuades from schism, if a church neglect to discipline for the grossest immoralities, whilst our plan proposes, that in regard to government, discipline, and mode of worship, each one shall, as heretofore, connect himself with that branch of the church, whose forms he believes best calculated to advance the kingdom of the Redeemer. His language in a letter to Farrel, is this: "I only contend for this, that they should not create schism in any church, which, although very corrupt in morals, and infected with strange doctrines, *had not entirely departed from that doctrine*, on which Paul informs us, the church of Christ is founded." Can the reviewer embrace these views? Can he emulate the magnanimity of Calvin? We fear not. Seeing, then, that he does not agree with Calvin on some material points, and yet considers himself a good Calvinist, he should endeavour, at least as an achievement in mental discipline, if not from higher motives, to train his mind to the habit of judging others by the same rule, which he applies to himself.

But the reviewer also *misrepresents* the book.

He asserts, "Our author lets no opportunity pass of saying something unfair of this great man" (Calvin). This statement was indeed news to the writer himself; and, after a re-examination of his work, he is still of opinion, that it is totally destitute of foundation. On several topics the writer did, what every one has a perfect right to do, and what the reviewer does of others, without any signs of trepidation, he stated the dissentient opinions of Calvin; and on Confirmation, which Lutherans regard merely as a solemn mode of admitting to sacramental communion, he adduced Calvin's testimony in favor of it; but it was his aim to do it fairly, nor has he seen any reason, in the review, to doubt his success. There are, we think, but four topics in the book in reference to which Calvin is mentioned. In not a single case is any thing disrespectful said of him; in one place he is styled "the illustrious Calvin" (p. 37.) in another "the distinguished reformer" (p. 252), in a third again "the illustrious Calvin" (p. 239), and in the fourth (p. 247), Calvin and the other reformers are together spoken of, as "men, distinguished so highly for intellect, and chosen of God to accomplish so great a work." Does this language justify the reviewer's charge? But he asserts, that the views of Calvin are misrepresented in being called "peculiar." His misapprehension of this phrase we have above explained. All that it implies, is proved by a confession which the reviewer unfortunately for himself makes on the subject. He says, "It is true, that Calvin's views were opposed by some men of that day, and that even some of the reformers thought his mode of stating the doctrine of predestination, and the prominence he gave to it, not wise." If there had been nothing peculiar about his views, would the others have opposed him? It was the absoluteness of the decree of predestination, which his opponents disapproved; for, that the Lutheran church ancient or

modern has rejected the doctrine of divine decrees altogether, we did not assert, and the Popular Theology affirms the reverse.

Again, the reviewer misrepresents the discussion of the *Trinity!* Without the shadow of truth he asserts: "Our author has supposed that he would explain the doctrine of the trinity by the science of algebra,"—and "he affects a knowledge denied to man," and after a long string of ungentlemanly, not to say unchristian observations, designed to cast ridicule on the book and its author, he passes this off as a fair account of the writer's discussion of the article of the Trinity. Now would any reader infer from this, that the whole discussion of the trinity itself, making ten pages, consists entirely of scripture proofs, and a digested, yet simple, statement of their meaning? Would he suppose, that the reference to algebraic letters, does not occur in the discussion of the doctrine of the trinity at all, but in some supplementary remarks, added not to explain the trinity, but to show that the objections drawn from reason, against this doctrine as taught by scripture, are futile even on the grounds of reason itself? And, that even there they are not referred to as an explanation of the essence and persons of the trinity, as the reviewer affirms, but that in showing, that the *words* persons and essence, are not used in their common signification as in reference to men, these *words* are compared to the algebraic letters, as designating certain *relations* revealed in scripture, whose intrinsic nature is unknown? Would the reader believe, that throughout the whole book there is not a single sentence pretending to explain the intrinsic nature of the trinity? Yet all this is the fact, and may be inferred even from the following extract from the book itself; which forms the transition from the discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity to that of the objections alledged against it. "From these scripture proofs it is evident, that the sacred volume most undoubtedly does teach a threefold distinction in the Deity, a distinction which is not merely figurative, or modal, or subjective, but real. The intrinsic nature of this distinction is *not revealed* in scripture, and is *wholly incomprehensible to us.* Yet is the charge of contradiction between the declarations of the sacred volume on this subject and the dictates of reason, which is so often and confidently made, demonstrably inapplicable to a judicious statement of this tenet. The pious believer will find no difficulty in admitting this doctrine; for he sees its beauty and harmony running through the whole plan of salvation; yet, as this volume will doubtless fall into the hands of many who are perplexed with honest doubts on this subject, and as several respected individuals of this class have expressed a desire, that the relation of the doctrine of the Trinity to reason might be considered in it; the writer subjoins the following seven propositions, the principles of which, he trusts, contain satisfactory answers to all such objections that can be started. And may the good Spirit of God bless the entire discussion of this article, to the conviction of the sincere inquirer after truth!" Where now,—to say nothing of that sense of honor, which governs high-minded men of the world—where, we ask, is that honesty which should ever characterize the Christian? Was it the spirit of the Saviour which guided the reviewer in such gross misrepresentations of the book?

But we pass by other similar representations, such as his censuring the introduction of a discussion on civil governments, and, concealing the fact that he had before his eyes an entire article of the Confession, calling for the discussion;—and hasten to elucidate several parts of his review, in which he *exposes his want of acquaintance with the topics under discussion.*

He positively denies, that Luther, or a single one of the early reformers, rejected Calvin's views of *absolute* predestination! The Popular Theology admits Luther's attachment to that doctrine in his earlier life, and his having taught it in some of his works; but affirms that he, Melancthon and their coadjutors eventually rejected it from their creed. Our argument from the declaration of the Augsburg Confession, which condemns "the opinion of those who teach, that such as have once become pious, cannot fall from grace," or as the Latin copy reads: "cannot lose the Holy Spirit," he disposes of in a summary way, by calling the persons referred to *perfectionists!* It does not seem to have occurred to him, that if they were such perfectionists, they must have been Calvinists; if the pious cannot fall from grace at all, they cannot fall finally. And then, the unqualified condemnation of the opinion that the pious cannot "lose the Holy Spirit," without the reservation "finally," which the reviewer would interpolate, and the fact that this reservation is taught no where else in the entire Confession, appear clearly to decide against the reviewer's interpretation. Our arguments from Luther's own words, the reviewer passes over in silence.

As this is a subject on which it is easy to err, and on which men of more Christian spirit and learning than the reviewer displays, have entertained different opinions, it may be useful to devote a few moments to its elucidation. It is of no use here to quote passages from Luther's works teaching this doctrine. The Popular Theology had admitted his former adhesion to the Augustinian view of this subject. In reply to the reviewer's passage from Luther's work to Erasmus, which was written in the earlier part of his life, about twenty-one years before his death, when he had not yet laid off many of the Romish and Augustinian opinions which he subsequently rejected; we might present hundreds of passages teaching and implying the contrary opinion. We present a single specimen carefully translated by us from Walch's edition (the best) of Luther on the Galatians. We select this that those who have the English translation of this excellent work, may compare it, and see how uncertain a guide such translations are on disputed points. "And all the prophets foresaw in Spirit, that Christ would be the greatest sinner, whose like never appeared on earth. For as he is made a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, he is not an innocent person and without sin, is not the Son of God in his glory, but he is a sinner for a season forsaken of God, Psalm viii. 6. He bears the sin of St. Paul, who was a blasphemer, a persecutor and injurious; of St. Peter who denied Christ; and of David, who was an adulterer and a murderer, and caused the name of the Lord to be blasphemed among the gentiles. In short, he is the person who hath taken upon himself, and bears in his own body *all the sins of all men in the whole world, who ever have lived, are now living, or*

who shall hereafter live; not as if he had himself committed those sins, but being committed by us, he took them on his own body, in order to make an atonement for them with his own blood."* We might refer the reader to a work entitled "Lutherus Lutheranus," of 700 pages 8vo, consisting entirely of extracts from his works, showing that on all the distinguishing points between Calvinists and Lutherans, Luther occupied the ground subsequently maintained by his followers. But obviously, even this would not settle the point. The only impartial and decisive course is to examine all his works, and also all his correspondence, according to their date; and trace the gradual change in his opinions. This, according to the unanimous testimony of all Germany, no man has ever done more impartially than the celebrated Dr. Plank, Professor of Theology at Gœttingen, in the preparation of his invaluable work, entitled, "*History of the Rise, changes, and Formation of our Protestant System of Doctrines,* from the commencement of the Reformation till the Introduction of the Form of Concord." (1580.) The entire impartiality and great ability of this work, which cost the author twenty years of labor and investigation, are conceded by all parties. The result of his examination may be seen in the following valuable quotation, which, whilst it fully sustains the positions of the Popular Theology, also renders it intelligible, how such a diversity of sentiment might naturally exist on this subject. "Nevertheless, the Lutheran divines did not, for a long time, see proper to take any notice of it, (viz: of the prominence and full developement given to this doctrine by Calvin, and of its introduction into the Swiss churches;) and even the zealots of Lower Saxony, who had taken occasion from the Geneva "Consensus," to renew the contest concerning the Lord's supper, observed a perfect silence on this incalculably more important doctrine, although Calvin appeared to urge them the more explicitly to its adoption. Melanchthon alone declared to him, that although he would not quarrel with him about it, he would never consent to adopt his (Calvin's) views on predestination.† But the silence of the other Lutheran divines on this subject, although it might appear to have been the result of indifference, was owing to a very satisfactory reason, of which the greater part of them were well aware. It cannot be denied, that the Augustinian theory of Predestination had already been forsaken by the Lutheran church. Yet her divines could not but feel, that they had *changed* their ground. The fact could not be concealed, that Luther had once embraced this doctrine in its full rigor, and even zealously defended it against Erasmus, and that his early adherents, including even Melancthon himself, had at first done the same. It is indeed true, they could prove that the doctrine was not long retained, and *that Luther himself had abandoned it!* But even this concession would give an advantage to an opponent in

* See Walch's edition of Luther on the Galatians, p. 276.—"In summa, er ist die person, die an ihrem Leibe trœgt, und auf sich geladen hat alle Sünden aller menschen in der ganzen Welt, die da gewest, noch sind, und seyn werden." See also the common English version, p. 254.

† Melanchthon did not ever answer the first letter of Calvin, in which he requested his assent to the doctrine. See Calvin's epist. p. 133, 153.

this dispute, which they were utterly unwilling to concede to Calvin. They therefore determined, rather not to dispute with him on this subject at all. But there was another reason, which probably aided in causing them to keep silence on this subject. The greater part of Lutheran divines had, like Luther himself, receded from the Augustinian theory of predestination, very probably without themselves being fully aware how this result had been brought about. They found themselves removed from it, before they had wished to be; and it was Melanchthon, and no one else, who had produced the change. In the first improved edition of his *Loci Theologici*, and doubtless still earlier in his oral lectures, he had proposed a theory, which, both in its principles and consequences was in direct contradiction to the Augustinian view. This contradiction, which Melanchthon himself took no pains to bring to light, was however, at first, not generally perceived. Hence several of the principles of his new theory; were adopted with the less apprehension, especially as each one of them, considered by itself, appeared to be incontestibly true, both according to reason and Scripture. Thus his cardinal ideas of the divine election of all men in Christ, of the universality of divine grace, of the extension of the atonement and merits of Christ to all men, had been embraced by nearly all the divines of their party, and *by Luther himself*, before they perceived that their views of an absolute decree of God, and the Augustinian doctrine of predestination were utterly irreconcileable with them. But, when at last they made the discovery, they found their position in several respects an embarrassing one, and were unable immediately to extricate themselves. They felt unwilling, not only so suddenly to abandon a doctrine which they had professed; but even to abandon it at all. They were conscious that Augustin's doctrine of predestination appeared to be inseparably connected with some other parts of his system, such as the total inability of man to do any thing good, which they were firmly determined never to relinquish. On the other hand, they were just as anxious to retain the features of Melanchthon's theory, which they had adopted; and were therefore brought into a dilemma, which they could not but feel. The greater part of their divines now adhered to the view of Melanchthon, that God desires and strives to bestow salvation on all men in and through Christ, from which it necessarily followed, that his decree concerning the destiny of each individual could not be absolute. But they at the same time retained the opinion of Augustine, that depraved man can do nothing at all in the work of his salvation, cannot exert even the feeblest effort of his will; which seemed just as necessarily to imply that the salvation or damnation of each individual, could be decided only by an absolute decree of God. Some of them probably had an impression, that there must be some method of avoiding the last mentioned inference; but their views were indistinct. Hence it happened, that during the Synergistic controversies some of them again embraced the Augustinian theory in full. The greater part of them, however, believed that all they wanted was a more systematic adjustment and connexion of the opinions they entertained, and this conviction was undoubtedly the principal reason for that caution,

with which, in direct opposition to the polemic spirit of that age, they evaded a controversy on this subject. It was, therefore, not until 1561, that a formal dispute on this subject occurred between the Lutheran and Calvinistic divines, the occasion of which was the celebrated Zanchius, at that time professor of theology at Strasburg."* Here then is a correct and impartial statement of the facts in the case, which never has been, and never can be successfully controverted. We might easily confirm the different items of this statement by copious extracts from the writings of our early divines, but *cui bono?* We have different editions of all Luther's works at hand, we have the Loci Communes of Melanchthon now before us; and, after glancing again at the articles "De vocabulo gratiæ," and "De prædestinatione," we are amazed at the unconscientious recklessness of the reviewer in so positively asserting, that not one of the reformers abandoned the doctrine of absolute predestination! We had marked a dozen passages, to confirm the statement of Dr. Plank concerning this distinguished reformer; but our article is already extended beyond our original intention, and we refrain; merely advising our "flippant" reviewer, if his library or that of his institution contains the necessary works, rather to set himself to the study of the natural resources, than to retail, at second hand, statements that have been refuted a hundred times.

That our reviewer should know but little of German divines, would perhaps be excusable, if he did not so dogmatically undertake to contradict the statements of others, without understanding fairly what he says or whereof he affirms; but what shall we say to similar erroneous statements concerning American divines? The declaration of the Popular Theology, that "the principal divines of New England are also unwilling to term these decrees *unconditional and absolute*, however they may differ as to the circumstances, which in the divine mind led to their adoption," he flatly denies, and with singular infelicity asserts (how "flippantly" we will not say) that Dr. Woods would not assent to our affirmation. We will therefore let Dr. W. speak for himself, and thus have the pleasure of introducing the reviewer to a better acquaintance with that respectable and venerable servant of Christ, than he seems hitherto to have enjoyed; merely reminding the reader that we had asserted nothing about the *opinions* of those divines on this subject, but only that they are "unwilling to term these decrees *unconditional and absolute.*"

"We inquire next (says Dr. Woods, in his Letters to Unitarians†) whether the purpose of God respecting the salvation of men is *unconditional and absolute.* I know that in consequence of particular errors which have prevailed, it has been so represented by many of its advocates. But the language is certainly liable to be misunderstood, and ought not to be used without special care. Why should we employ words, which will not convey, truly and exactly, to the minds of others, the views which we ourselves entertain?

---

* Dr. Plank's Geschichte, &c. vol. vi. pp. 806, 809. Gœttingen 1800.

† Pp. 65, 66, of the edition of 1820.

Here, as before, I look at the divine conduct in saving sinners, considering that as exactly corresponding with the previous divine purpose. And my inquiry is,—does God actually save sinners *unconditionally?* The first answer I give to this is, that God would never have saved them, had not Christ interposed, and made an atonement. This, then, is a *condition* of human salvation; it is the grand event, on account of which God forgives. But I inquire farther; does God actually save sinners, that is, forgive them, and receive them into his kingdom, without any condition *on their part?* The Bible furnishes the answer. "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." "He that believeth shall be saved." This is the uniform representation of the Bible. The condition of eternal life *to be performed by men*, is repentance, faith, obedience. They can no more be saved without these, than without the death of Christ. These conditions it is true, are of a different nature from the atonement; but they are equally necessary. From this view of the subject, I come to a satisfactory conclusion. If God does not actually save sinners without conditions, he did not purpose to save them without conditions,—his purpose and conduct always agreeing with each other. In his eternal purpose, he regarded *the same conditions*, and regarded them *in the same manner*, as he does now, when he saves. Clearly then, the purpose of God to save men, cannot, in this respect be considered as unconditional. And as the word is apt to be understood, as excluding all regard to these conditions, and being so understood, involves a palpable and dangerous error; *the use of it ought I think to be avoided*, except where the particular error to be confuted, or some other circumstances, will show plainly, that it is used in a sense agreeable to the truth." This quotation is too explicit to need remark. Independently of its sound reasoning, it affirms exactly what the Popular Theology declares. Whether the reviewer's beloved brethren of East Windsor, to whom he also appeals, would stand by him in this emergency any better than Dr. Woods, we have not the means of knowing.

There is but one other topic on which we feel it necessary to make any remark, namely the alarming bustle, which the reviewer makes about the Popular Theology, denying, that any one will be consigned to perdition for Adam's sin; or that God will condemn us for the fact of being born with a depraved nature; because we venture to affirm, as the reviewer says even *totidem verbis.* "We cannot suppose that God would condemn us to perdition and eternal misery merely on account of this depraved (disordered) nature; for we are in no sense the authors or causes of it; and a just God will not punish his creatures for acts they did not perform," apparently implying by his surprise, that this is something new. He adds without any other proofs, that on the subject of depravity, innate and actual, "the author is as loose, and as contrary to the whole teachings of God's word, as any Socinian could reasonably ask him to be." Now this is a grave charge. And if the vituperative character of the review, the apparently *innate* propensity of the reviewer to scatter at random the various names of heresy regardless where they fall, did not so fully disarm his charge in the minds of impartial readers, we should feel as if we ought to set

about a formal effort, to clear our skirts of Socinianism, now for the first time in our life, laid to our charge. But how a conscientious man, with the Popular Theology in his hand, could find it in his heart to associate its author in any way with Socinians, we do not see; and will cheerfully refer to that righteous judge, before whom the writer and reviewer must both soon render their account.

As to the *imputation* of the *guilt* of Adam's sin, the reviewer ought to have known before entering on his task, that that doctrine has been rejected by the great mass of Lutheran divines for near a century past. It is rejected by the Moravians, who also profess the Augsburg Confession. It is rejected by our Methodist brethren, by a large portion of the Episcopal, Baptist, and Congregational churches of our land. Spangenberg, in his Exposition of Moravian Doctrine, translated from the German by Latrobe, which is the avowed expose of the doctrines of the United Brethren, says: "Thus are all men, *who do not submit to be delivered from their corruption*, under the wrath of God, according to Ephes. ii. 3, and forasmuch as all have sinned; 1 Kings viii. 46, so hath death also passed upon all men.—Rom. v. 12; vi. 20." Again, "It is evident, that the sin on account of which men are damned, consists in this, that they will not believe the divine and salutary truth, that God has so loved them, as even to give his only begotten Son to be the Saviour of the world."* The celebrated Dr. Dwight, whose Theology contains a fair representation of the views of a large portion of the New England divines, and of many others in England and America, says: "When I assert, that in consequence of the apostacy of Adam, all men have sinned; I do not intend, that the posterity of Adam are guilty of his transgression. Moral actions are not, so far as I can see, transferable from one being to another. The personal act of any agent is in its very nature, the act of that agent solely, and incapable of being participated by any other agent. Of course, the guilt of such a personal act, is equally incapable of being transferred or participated. Neither do I intend that the descendants of Adam are punished for his transgression"† Dr. Woods, in his Letters to Unitarians, says: "The orthodox of New England at the present day are not chargeable with the same fault. *The imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity*, in any sense which those words naturally and properly convey, *is a doctrine which we do not believe.* If any shall say, as Stapfer does, who refers to Vitringa and other reformed divines as agreeing with him, "that for God to give Adam a posterity like himself, and to impute his sin to them, is one and the same thing, I should not object to such an imputation." And to this opinion of the Dr. the writer cordially assents. Such an imputation is taught in the Popular Theology, only it is called by its right name.

In regard to the total inability of man to turn to God or save himself by his own strength, the absolute necessity of the influences of the Spirit, and the sufficiency of the means and grace of God for the conversion and salvation of all who sincerely seek and use them,

---

* P. 89, and p. 196.

† Vol. I., pp. 478—479.

all which doctrines are taught in the Popular Theology; a few extracts will show, that the ground held by the Lutheran church, is exactly that of the Moravian, the Methodist, and some other churches. "The Lutheran church (says the Pop. Theol. p. 123,) has always regarded the doctrine of natural depravity as a primary article of the Christian system. Nor, can it with propriety be viewed in any other light; as it is the only certain basis for our belief in the necessity of a Saviour, and of the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. The doctrine is, moreover, so frequently and forcibly inculcated in the word of God, that no man ought to profess to be a believer in the Scriptures who denies its truth." Again, "The great body of Lutheran divines, has regarded natural or innate depravity, as that disorder in the mental and bodily constitution of man, which was introduced by the fall of Adam, is transmitted by natural generation from parent to child, and the re-result of which is, that all men who are naturally engendered, evince in their action a want of holiness and a pre-disposition to sin." Again, p. 127, "This natural depravity disqualifies its subjects for heaven, because the action of depraved (disordered) faculties and powers would not even in heaven itself, be conformed to the divine law, and could not be acceptable to God." "The Lutheran system regards man as incapable of performing the conditions of salvation prescribed in the gospel (repentance and faith) without the gracious aid of God," but also maintains that this grace will be given, and these means be made effectual to all who sincerely seek and use them. Now that these are substantially the doctrines of all the non-Calvinistic evangelical churches of our land, we need not stop to prove. But as the reviewer, in the beginning of his article which seems to have been written at a different time and in a different spirit, makes some profession of Christian sympathy with other denominations, especially with our Moravian brethren, and as they profess the same creed with us, we will merely show him, that on this, as on all other important points of doctrine, they agree with us. "Yet God doth not stop here, but he addresses himself to the heart of man, and none is left without a visitation. But the misfortune is, that either the poor human race, for the most part, pays no attention to such calls, or does not follow the divine drawings." (p. 63.) Again; "The number with whom the Holy *Ghost found* entrance, was at that time very inconsiderable," p. 184. "But the poor slave of sin and of the devil must *become willing* to receive the grace of God in Christ, that is offered to him," p. 196. "For if any one who still loves and is a slave of sin, who *will* not be converted to God, or who if he has been converted, gives way to evil, neither acknowledging nor repenting of it, or desisting from his sin," &c. p. 219. From all that has now been said, it is evident, that the reviewer must either retract his denunciations of the Popular Theology and the Lutheran church, or resign more than half of the entire American church to the same fate: which he will do is to us personally a matter of very small interest; although as a professed disciple of the Lord Jesus, we shall always rejoice in every demonstration of fraternal regard and affection among Christians.

In conclusion, we would ask, what good is to result to the cause of the Redeemer from such attempts, as the reviewer has essayed, to abuse and ridicule individuals or denominations for not being Calvinists, who do not profess to be? Are individuals of other denominations no longer to be permitted to publish, what they believe to be the truth of God, without personal abuse and detraction? If the book contains errors in the reviewer's opinion, why did he not with due observance of the rules of decency and Christian decorum towards the author, endeavour in the spirit of Christian kindness, to controvert its supposed errors from Scripture and reason? From such men, all professions of friendship for other denominations who entertain the same views, or even opinions more different still from Calvinism, are too shallow to mislead. Such ebulitions of hatred and bigotry as the reviewer betrays, merely prove that Romish intolerance yet dwells in nominally Protestant bosoms. The only thing wanting is power, and such men would light up the fires of persecution as readily as ever papal bigot did in days gone by. It is such scenes, that cause the intelligent Protestant community so often to sympathize with the Roman Catholics, in the efforts made against them; to mistrust the safety of our liberties in the hands of their Protestant leaders, as much as in those of the Catholics, and believe themselves safest when the balance of power is divided equally between both. In as far as such efforts succeed in diminishing the usefulness of an individual, they must of course be matter of regret to him and the friends of religion; but the responsibility rests with the detractor, and remains to be met by him at his final account.

S. S. Schmucker.

Theol. Sem., Gettysburg,
Sept. 14th, 1839.

Notices, Receipts, Accounts, Answer to Letters, &c.

August 27—Sept. 23, 1839. Rev. Richard Johnson, Columbia, S. C. $2.50 for 1839, name added and back numbers sent.—George Dunn, Esq. Petersburg, Va. $5, on account, (for 1836 and '7,) per A. G. of Balt.—Mrs. Ann Patterson of Philadelphia, $2.50 for 1839.—Rev. A. Macklin of Philadelphia, $2.50 for '39.—Rev. John L. Pitts, Rev. S. W. Harkey and Dr. Albert Ritchie, of Frederick city, Md. names added from September, '39.—Rev. Wm. M. Atkinson, Winchester, Va. $2. 50 for one year, and name added.—Miss C. McKenzie, direction changed to Philadelphia, paid $3 in full to the end of '39—and discontinued at that time.—We have received a cheering letter from J.Wayt, Esq. of Waynesboro' Va. for which we are obliged; and have credited the money enclosed, to himself $2.50,—and to Rev. James C. Wilson $2.50.—Rev. Colin McIver of N. C.—inclosing $2.50 for Alexander Morrison and $2.50 for John Thompson—both of Fayetteville and both for '39; Mr. T. being a new subscriber and the back Nos. sent. The sermon inquired for by Mr. McI. was published in our No. 12 of Vol. II. for December, 1836. If we can lay our hands on odd Nos. without breaking a Vol. we will send them with much pleasure. The printed document also came to hand; and if we can command the leisure will be disposed of as suggested.—Austin P. Cox,

Frankfort, Ky., name added to our list, and the VOLS. for 1835, 6, 7 and 8 together with the Nos. for this year up to September inclusive,—sent to Grigg and Elliott of Phil.; from whom we have received per R. Armstrong of Balt. $12.50—for the five volumes—to the end of this year.—Rev. J. N. Shepperd—direction changed to Utica, Licking Co. Ohio; and $5 credited to his account, which pays up to June, 1839. We have no No. for February, 1838, which we could send without breaking an entire set. We will however, attend to the matter and if we can obtain one, will send it with the others written for.—Mr. Owen Gill, Pratt street, near Gay, Balt. name added from October, '39.—S. Bickley, Baltimore, paid $2.50 for '39.

FIVE HUNDRED copies of the first Article of this No. were printed off and distributed by sale and otherwise, in pamphlet form, in Baltimore, about the middle of September. The eagerness with which they were sought after, is another evidence of the deep interest which pervades the public mind on the whole subject. It is with regret we are obliged to state, that the *American and Republican Newspapers*, refused to print a separate advertisement of the pamphlet, when offered by one of our booksellers!—How melancholy is this proof of all that the article itself asserts, of the condition of the press? Papers that teem with advertisements and puffs of scores of public immoralities, dare not admit three lines to say, a feeble voice is raised on the side of public virtue; if so be, the priests do not give consent.

UNPRECEDENTED AND EXTRAORDINARY ACCIDENT.—A correspondent in Frederick city, Md. under date of Sept. 16, informs us that "Priest ——— has got a young widow here *enciente* and has run off Father ——— sent her to Baltimore, but she would not stay. She is back, sent for our Mayor, for the constable and for a lawyer to know what she could do. The thing has taken wind, and every body knows it; the Catholics confess it, &c. &c." As it is one of those *rare occurrences* which may never come to pass again; the heretics will of course, take no notice of it, and soon forget it. The refugee priest will go into another diocese! and get *new faculties* (supposing any *new* ones necessary!) and the whole affair will blow over. It is however rather unfortunate that the matter should explode, so soon after PRIEST RYDER's harangues in favor of papal purity; and in such juxta position to the Nun's case in Baltimore. Might it not be adviseable for Mr. Eccleston to remove one of our Baltimore Nunneries, (we have near half a dozen white and black, branch and principal)—up to Frederick? In that case such accidents would be provided against; or could at least be concealed.

THE AUTHOR of the letter signed a "*Seeker after Reform*"—can have an interview with us whenever he pleases; and his object accomplished—if we approve it—after examination. We have not called to examine the papers referred to—because we do nothing in the indirect way, in which our interposition was solicited. We try to be honest and recommend the same course to him. His soul is worth more than *his "situation,"* whatever that may be.

☞ OUR RESPECTED correspondent in *East Tennessee* is informed that we have received his letter of Sept. 4, and the printed documents accompanying it. We should be indebted to him, or to any other friend in that region, for a full narrative of the rise, progress, and present state of the troubles in the Presbyterian churches there, to form a part of our series of MEMOIRS, on the Semi-Pelagian Controversy. We have been surprised and grieved at the backwardness of those who know important facts in regard to this great controversy, in committing them to a faithful record; as well as, at the indolence and carelessness of others who might easily compile and perpetuate a body of evidence, which our children will grieve